

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in connection with the present application. Claims 1, 12 and 15 are independent claims. Independent claims 1, 12 and 15 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 17 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Bai/Cady Rejection

Claims 1-4, 7 and 9-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,326,700) in view of Cady et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,576,992). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Initially, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12 and 15. For example, the independent claims have been amended to recite a wiring pattern having first and second wirings, and the wiring pattern being formed on at least one of the first and second faces.

The Examiner alleges that Bai et al. teaches a first wiring 22 and a second wiring 221. Even assuming that Bai et al. teaches a first wiring 22 and a second wiring 221, Bai et al. does not teach that a wiring pattern including the first and second wiring, the wiring pattern being formed on at least the first and second faces as recited in the independent claims.

In addition, Cady et al. fails to cure the deficiency of Bai et al. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 12 and 15 are patentable over Bai et al. and Cady et al. Dependent

claims 2-4, 7, 9-11, 13, 14 and 16 are also patentable for respectively depending on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103 Bai/Cady/Taniguchi Rejection

ClaimS 5 and 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bai et al. in view of Cady et al. in further view of Taniguchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,388,333). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As remarked above, a combination of Bai et al. and Cady et al. fail to teach each and every feature of claim 1. In addition, Taniguchi et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Bai et al. and Cady et al. Accordingly, claims 5 and 6 are patentable for depending on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103 Bai/Cady/Takashima Rejection

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bai et al. in view of Cady et al. in further view of Takashima et al. (U.S. Patent 6,160,313). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As remarked above, a combination of Bai et al. and Cady et al. fail to teach each and every feature of claim 1. In addition, Takashima et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Bai et al. and Cady et al. Accordingly, claim 8 are patentable for depending on an allowable base claim.

<remainder of page intentionally left blank>

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-17 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant hereby petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$120.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By


John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/LYP:psy